



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,737	01/11/2002	Anthony E. Martinez	RSW920010153US1	1564

7590 05/02/2006
Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the interview on March 10, 2006.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-17 remain pending in the case. Claims 1, 2, 13 and 14 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of Claims 1, 2 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Malamud et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030142123; publication date July 31, 2002; filed January 16, 2003; continuation of application filed January 21, 1999) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The rejections of Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud in view of Petropoulos et al. (U.S. Pub. No 20030146939; publication date August 7, 2003; filed September 24, 2001) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

5. The rejections of Claims 4 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud in view of Krause (U.S. Patent 6160554; date of patent December 12, 2000; filed March 19, 1998) have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20030142123; publication date July 31, 2002; filed January 16, 2003; continuation of application filed January 21, 1999) in view of Ma et al. (U.S. Patent 6731315; date of patent May 4, 2004; filed November 30, 1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, Malamud discloses a graphic previewer image comprising a virtual sensor portion and a content-previewing portion (p.3, para. 42, 44) since Malamud teaches information pointers that display graphical and/or textual information about objects to which the cursor points.

Malamud further discloses means for rendering, within the content-previewing portion, a preview of the content, responsive to determining that the virtual sensor portion has been positioned over the representation of the content (p.3, para. 42, 44) since Malamud teaches rendering and displaying graphical and/or textual information about objects to which the cursor points.

Malamud further discloses means for enabling a user to position the virtual sensor portion of the graphic previewer image over a representation of content to be previewed (Figures 2Q1, 2Q2, 2Q3; p.3, para. 42, 44; p.6, para. 66-68) since Malamud teaches the cursor pointing to an object and the information associated with the preview being displayed. Malamud does not disclose the representation is at least partially viewable through a center area of the virtual sensor portion. Ma teaches text being viewable through a center area of a cursor (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 56-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Ma before him at the time the invention was made, to modify viewing a representation with a virtual sensor portion as taught by Malamud to include viewing the representation through a center portion of the virtual sensor portion as taught by Ma, because Malamud teaches using a virtual sensor portion to select text to preview (p.3, para. 42, 44) and Ma teaches previewing text through the virtual sensor portion (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 56-66) so the cursor taught by Malamud could be modified so that text could be displayed through the sensor portion.

Regarding independent claim 2, Malamud discloses rendering, within the content-previewing portion, a preview of the content to be previewed, responsive to detecting that the virtual sensor portion has been dragged over the representation (p.3, para. 44) since Malamud teaches rendering and displaying graphical and/or textual information about objects to which the cursor points.

Malamud further discloses providing a previewer graphic for dragging over a representation of content to be previewed, the previewer graphic comprising a virtual sensor portion and a content-previewing portion (Figures 2Q1, 2Q2, 2Q3; p.3, para. 42, 44; p.6, para. 66-68) since Malamud teaches dragging the cursor to point to an object and the information associated with the preview being displayed. Malamud does not disclose the representation is at least partially viewable through a center area of the virtual sensor portion when the virtual sensor portion is dragged over the representation. Ma teaches text being viewable through a center area of a cursor when the cursor is positioned over the text (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 56-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Ma before him at the time the invention was made, to modify viewing a representation with a virtual sensor portion as taught by Malamud to include viewing the representation through a center portion of the virtual sensor portion as taught by Ma, because Malamud teaches using a virtual sensor portion to select text to preview (p.3, para. 42, 44) and Ma teaches previewing text through the virtual sensor portion (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 56-66) so the cursor taught by Malamud could be modified so that text could be displayed through the sensor portion.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Malamud discloses the method according to claim 2, wherein the previewer graphic replaces a cursor of a visual display of the computing system (p.3, para. 42) since the information pointer replaces the cursor.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding dependent claim 11, Malamud discloses the method according to claim 2, wherein the rendered preview uses cached information associated with the content to be previewed (p.6, para. 70) since stored information is used with the preview.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Malamud discloses the method according to claim 2, wherein the representation is a file icon and the content to be previewed is a stored file associated with the file icon (p.6, para. 68; Figure 2Q3) since a file associated with a file icon is previewed.

Regarding independent claim 13, Malamud discloses means for detecting that the virtual sensor portion has been dragged over the representation (p.3, para. 44 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Malamud teaches a pictorial representation of the contents of the object being output when the tip of a cursor arrow obscures a portion of the object).

Malamud further discloses means for rendering, within the content-previewing portion, a preview of the content to be previewed, responsive to the means for detecting (p.3, para. 42, 44 – as demonstrated in the cited text, Malamud teaches a pictorial representation of the contents of the object being output when the tip of a cursor arrow obscures a portion of the object).

Malamud further discloses means for providing a previewer graphic for dragging over a representation of content to be previewed, the previewer graphic comprising a virtual sensor portion and a content-previewing portion (Figures 2Q1, 2Q2, 2Q3; p.3,

Art Unit: 2178

para. 42, 44; p.6, para. 66-68) since Malamud teaches information pointers that display graphical and/or textual information about objects to which the cursor points in the center area of the information pointer. Malamud does not disclose the representation is at least partially viewable through a center area of the virtual sensor portion when the virtual sensor portion is dragged over the representation. Ma teaches text being viewable through a center area of a cursor when the cursor is positioned over the text (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 56-66). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Ma before him at the time the invention was made, to modify viewing a representation with a virtual sensor portion as taught by Malamud to include viewing the representation through a center portion of the virtual sensor portion as taught by Ma, because Malamud teaches using a virtual sensor portion to select text to preview (p.3, para. 42, 44) and Ma teaches previewing text through the virtual sensor portion (Figure 1; col. 2, lines 56-66) so the cursor taught by Malamud could be modified so that text could be displayed through the sensor portion.

Regarding independent claim 14, the claim reflects a computer program product comprising computer-readable program code for performing the system of claim 13 and is rejected along the same rationale.

7. Claims 3, 5, 7-9, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud in view of Ma in further view of Petropoulos et al. (U.S. Pub. No 20030146939; publication date August 7, 2003; filed September 24, 2001).

Regarding dependent claims 3, 15 and 17, Malamud does not disclose the representation is a hyperlink and the content to be previewed is a Web page accessible using the hyperlink. Petropoulos teaches a hyperlink as a representation and previewing a Web page when a link is accessed (Figure 1; p.2, para. 23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention was made, to modify previewing content as taught by Malamud to include previewing Web pages and hyperlinks as representations as taught by Petropoulos, because opening each Web page to determine if the contained material is relevant is unwieldy and time consuming, as taught by Petropoulos (p.1, para. 7,8), as is opening files and documents, as taught by Malamud. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because allowing the user to preview a Web page before opening the page would save time and efficiently utilize resources since irrelevant Web pages would not be opened and browsed.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Malamud does not disclose the rendered preview comprises a thumbnail version of the Web page. Petropoulos teaches a thumbnail version of the Web page as the rendered preview (Figure 1; p.1, para. 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention was made, to modify previewing content as taught by Malamud to include previewing Web pages as thumbnails as taught by Petropoulos, because opening each Web page to determine if the contained

Art Unit: 2178

material is relevant is unwieldy and time consuming, as taught by Petropoulos (p.1, para. 7,8) as is opening files and documents, as taught by Malamud. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because allowing the user to preview a thumbnail version of the Web page before opening the page would save time and efficiently utilize resources since irrelevant Web pages would not be opened and browsed.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Malamud does not disclose navigating to the Web page, responsive to a user's request and displaying the Web page, responsive to the navigating. Petropoulos teaches navigating to the Web page responsive to a request and displaying the Web page (p.4, para. 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention was made, to modify previewing content as taught by Malamud to include navigating to and displaying a Web page as taught by Petropoulos, because displaying the Web page would allow the user to view the entire Web page at full size per the user's request. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because allowing the user navigate to the Web page if he/she desired to would present the page at full size for browsing, printing, etc.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Malamud does not disclose the user's request is signaled by clicking within the previewer graphic. Petropoulos teaches requesting by clicking (p.4, para. 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art,

having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention was made, to modify previewing content as taught by Malamud to include signaling a request by clicking as taught by Petropoulos, because displaying the Web page would allow the user to view the entire Web page at full size per the user's request and clicking to signal a request would allow users to easily access the page. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because allowing the user to navigate to the Web page if he/she desired would present the page at full size for browsing, printing, etc.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Malamud does not disclose the previewer graphic remains positioned over the displayed Web page. Petropoulos teaches the previewer graphic positioned over the displayed Web page (p.4, para. 42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Petropoulos before him at the time the invention was made, to modify a previewer graphic as taught by Malamud to include the previewer graphic positioned over the displayed page as taught by Petropoulos, because positioning the previewer graphic over the displayed page would allow the user to view the preview alongside the associated information on the displayed page that caused the preview. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because viewing the preview with the displayed page would allow the user to compare the preview to the page in order to determine if further navigation to the full version of the page is necessary.

8. Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malamud in view of Ma in further view of Krause (U.S. Patent 6160554; date of patent December 12, 2000; filed March 19, 1998).

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 16, Malamud discloses the content to be previewed is a stored file (p.6, para. 68).

Malamud does not disclose the representation is a file name and the content is identified using the file name. Krause teaches the file name as the representation and identification (col. 1, lines 52-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Malamud and Krause before him at the time the invention was made, to modify previewing a stored file as taught by Malamud to include the a file name as the representation as taught by Krause, because Krause teaches a representation as a file name or an icon (col. 1, lines 56-61) and Malamud teaches a representation as an icon (p.6, para. 68; Figure 2Q3) so a file could be represented as either a name or an icon. It would have been advantageous to one of ordinary skill to utilize such combination because previewing stored files based on file names would allow the method to be used by more users with different storing preferences.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2178

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Evans (U.S. Patent 6016137).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


KBH


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER